

**REMARKS**

Applicants, by the amendments presented above and the arguments presented below, have made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record and thus to place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-24, 26-30, 32-35, 37-42, 44-47 and 49-58 are currently pending. Claims 57 and 58 are newly added. Claims 1, 10, 22, 29, 34 and 39-42 have been amended herein. Claims 9, 21, 25, 31, 36 and 43 have previously been cancelled. Claim 48 has been cancelled herein.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12, 19, 22, 24, 26, 28-30, 32-35, 37-42, 48 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 2,258,342 to Tinnerman.

Applicant has cancelled claim 48 herein and, therefore, considers the rejection of this claim to be moot.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, 29, 34 and 39-42 to change the nut having a limited range of movement "in at least two dimensions" to - in three dimensions -. Applicant states that the nut of the invention can move in either the "X" or "Y" dimensions, as well as the "Z" dimension (along the axis of the aperture of the nut). Applicant states that the Tinnerman '342 patent does not disclose or suggest that the nut has a limited range of movement in three dimensions, rather the Tinnerman '342 patent only discloses the nut having a limited range of movement in the "X" and "Z" dimensions as discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action - the nut cannot move in the "Y" dimension.

Serial No.: 10/674,198  
Art Unit: 3679

Further, on January 12, 2006, Applicant's attorney discussed this proposed amendment to these independent claims with the Examiner and the Examiner agreed that these independent claims with the proposed amendment would be allowable in view of the Tinnerman '342 patent, as well as in view of the prior art of record. If Applicant's understanding of the Examiner's position on this matter is incorrect in any manner, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney for discussion regarding same.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1, 10, 29, 34 and 39-42.

As claims 2, 3, 5-7, 51 and 52 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 1, and because Applicant states that independent claim 1 as amended is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 3, 5-7, 51 and 52.

As claims 11, 12, 19, 53 and 54 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 10, and because Applicant states that independent claim 10 as amended is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 11, 12, 19, 53 and 54.

As claims 30, 32 and 33 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 29, and because Applicant states that independent claim 29 as amended is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 30, 32 and 33.

As claims 35, 37 and 38 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 34, and because Applicant states that independent claim 34 as amended is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 35, 37 and 38.

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 22, in view of the Examiner's comments regarding Applicant's previous amendment to independent claim 22 and arguments for allowability, Applicant has amended independent claim 22 to remove language regarding "configured to be" or "capable of" such that the structure of the combination is definitive. In view of these amendments, Applicant states that independent claim 22 is allowable over the Tinnerman '342 patent as the Tinnerman '342 patent at least does not disclose or suggest that the nut member directly contacts the base portion. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 22.

As claims 23, 24, 26 and 28 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 22, and because Applicant states that independent claim 22 as amended is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 23, 24, 26 and 28. Applicant notes that a minor amendment has been made to claim 26 in view of the amendments made to independent claim 22.

*Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 2,258,342 to Tinnerman in view of United States Patent No. 2,303,148 to Tinnerman.

As claim 23 is dependent upon independent claim 22, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 23.

Serial No.: 10/674,198  
Art Unit: 3679

*Allowable Subject Matter*

The Examiner allowed claims 44-47.

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 8, 13-18, 20, 27, 49, 50, 55 and 56 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of Applicant's amendments to independent claims 1, 10, 29 and 34, Applicant has not amended claims 4, 8, 13-18, 20, 27, 49, 50, 55 and 56 into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As claims 4, 8 and 49 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 1, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance in view of the amendments made thereto, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 4, 8 and 49. As claims 13-18, 20, 27 and 50 are all ultimately dependent upon independent claim 10, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance in view of the amendments made thereto, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 13-18, 20, 27 and 50. As claim 55 is ultimately dependent upon independent claim 29, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance in view of the amendments made thereto, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 55. As claim 56 is ultimately dependent upon independent claim 34, which Applicant states is in condition for allowance in view of the amendments made thereto, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 56.

Serial No.: 10/674,198  
Art Unit: 3679

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

*Newly Added Claims*

Applicant has added new independent claims 57 and 58 herein.

New claims 57 and 58 are generally comparable to independent claims 1 and 29, respectively, except that new claims 57 and 58 require a limited range of movement of the nut member in two dimensions (rather than in three dimensions), but further require that neither of the two dimensions are provided along an axis about which the aperture of the nut member is defined. Applicant states that the Tinnerman '342 patent does not disclose or suggest that the nut has a limited range of movement in two dimensions, where neither of the two dimensions are provided along an axis about which the aperture of the nut member is defined. While the Tinnerman '342 patent discloses the nut having a limited range of movement in two dimensions, namely the "X" (according to the Examiner) and "Z" dimensions, as discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action, one of these two dimensions, namely the "Z" dimension, is provided along an axis about which the aperture of the nut member is defined, as is clearly illustrated in FIG. 1, and as identified by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action.

Further, on January 12, 2006, Applicant's attorney discussed this proposed addition of these type of independent claims with the Examiner and the Examiner agreed that these independent claims would be allowable in view of the Tinnerman '342 patent, as well as in view of the prior art of record. If Applicant's understanding of the Examiner's position on this matter is incorrect in any manner, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney for discussion regarding same.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of new independent claims 57 and 58.

Serial No.: 10/674,198  
Art Unit: 3679

***Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicant filed a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on January 18, 2006 in connection with this application. Applicant requests that the claims of this application be examined in view of the reference cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant states that the claims of this application are allowable in view of the reference cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-19-06

By: 

Richard A. Giangiorgi, Reg. No. 24,284  
James A. O'Malley, Reg. No. 45,952  
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,  
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 704-1890

912437

BEST AVAILABLE COPY